REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested. In the Advisory Action dated August 28, 2002, the Examiner indicated that the Amendment filed August 14, 2002 will not be entered because the amendments "are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal." However, Applicant respectfully submits that it is quite clear that the claim amendments do in fact place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. That is, the claim amendments overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejection, thereby leaving the prior art rejections as the only issue on appeal.

Claims 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 5 and 6 to improve clarity. Applicant submits that these amendments are self-explanatory and address the Examiner's questions raised in support of the § 112, second paragraph.

With regards to claim 10, the Examiner maintains that it is unclear (1) how the gradient temperature is related to suppressing the temperature rise of the alternator, (2) how such suppression of temperature creates a negative gradient, and (3) what is meant by the term "negative". As discussed in the specification on page 13, lines 6-7, "a temperature rise of the 3-phase alternator 1 is suppressed by the stepping-down DC/DC converter 12 having negative gradient temperature characteristics." One of skill in the art would recognize from this statement that, the DC/DC converter 12 has a negative gradient output voltage/temperature characteristic such that the output voltage of the DC/DC converter 12 is reduced as the temperature of the

DC/DC converter 12 increases. Further, the DC/DC converter 12 is disposed so as to receive the change of temperature of the alternator 1. When the temperature of the alternator 1 increases, the output voltage of the DC/DC converter 12 is reduced. Depending on the reduction of the output voltage of the DC/DC converter 12, the field current provided to the field coil 3 is reduced and the temperature rise of the alternator 1 is thus suppressed.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 5, 6 and 10.

In view of the above, entry of these amendments and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: October 11, 2002

Attorney Docket No.: Q63175

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE IN THE CLAIMS:

The claims are amended as follows:

5. (Twice Amended) The electrical power supply system for the automotive vehicle according to claim 1, wherein said voltage control means controls said [field] current of said [alternator] field coil based on a detected temperature of said field coil.

6. (Twice Amended) The electrical power supply system for the automotive vehicle according to claim 1, wherein said voltage control means controls said [field] current of said [alternator] field coil based on [an inferred] a temperature of said field coil inferred from said field current of said [alternator] field coil.